

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

JAMES MANALISAY,
Plaintiff,

v.

BOYDINE HALL, et al.,
Defendants.

Case No. 22-cv-04701-VC

**ORDER DENYING RULE 60(b)
MOTION TO REOPEN CASE**

Re: Dkt. No. 52

A final judgment was issued in this case on March 20, 2023, and the case was closed on the same day. The plaintiff has now filed a motion to reopen this case under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 60(b). He alleges that his case should be reopened because he has discovered new evidence. But a motion to reopen a case due to newly discovered evidence cannot be filed “more than a year after the entry of the judgment.” Fed. R. Civ. Proc. 60(c). Because the judgment in this case was filed over two years ago, this motion must be dismissed as untimely. Even if the motion were timely, the Court would deny it because Manalisay has not shown that reopening the case under Rule 60(b) would be justified.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: April 2, 2025



VINCE CHHABRIA
United States District Judge